

**IRC-5**Log # 10-18  
(for office use only)

**WASHINGTON STATE BUILDING CODE COUNCIL**  
**APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF A PROPOSED STATEWIDE AMENDMENT**  
**TO THE WASHINGTON STATE BUILDING CODE**

**1. State Building Code to be Amended.**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> International Building Code               | <input type="checkbox"/> Ventilation and Indoor Air Quality Code |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> International Residential Code | <input type="checkbox"/> International Mechanical Code           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ICC ANSI A117.1 Accessibility Code        | <input type="checkbox"/> International Fuel Gas Code             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International Fire Code                   | <input type="checkbox"/> NFPA 54 National Fuel Gas Code          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Uniform Plumbing Code                     | <input type="checkbox"/> NFPA 58 Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Energy Code                         |  |

Section R904.4Page 103**2. Applicant:**Annie O'Rourke**3. Signed:**

Annie O'Rourke \_\_\_\_\_ 2/28/10  
Proponent Title Date

**4. Contact Person:**

Annie O'Rourke \_\_\_\_\_  
Name Title  
Address: PO Box 1246  
Port Angeles, WA 98302  
Phone: 360 417-5615 Fax: ( )

**RECEIVED**

MAR 01 2010

**SBCC**

5. **Proposed Code Amendment** (Underline all added words, strike through deleted words) Additional pages may be attached.

Code 2009 IRC Section R404.4 Page 103

Amend section to read as follows:

**R404.4 Retaining Walls.** Retaining walls that are not laterally supported at the top and that retain in excess of 24 48 inches (~~610~~ 1219 mm) of unbalanced fill shall be designed to ensure stability against overturning, sliding, excessive foundation pressure and water uplift. Retaining walls shall be designed for a safety factor of 1.5 against lateral sliding and overturning.

## 6. Background information on amendment.

**NOTE:** State-wide and emergency state-wide amendments to the state building code should be based on one of the following criteria:

- (1) The amendment is needed to address a critical life/safety need.
- (2) The amendment is needed to address a specific state policy or statute.
- (3) The amendment is needed for consistency with state or federal regulations.
- (4) The amendment is needed to address a unique character of the state.
- (5) The amendment corrects errors and omissions.

The goal is to maintain consistency with R105.2 (3), R404.1.2.2, R404.1.2.2.1, R404.1.2.2.2 and R404.1.3. These sections speak specifically to the construction foundation walls that are not laterally supported at the top and retain up to 48 inches (1219 mm) of soil.

Log # 10-18  
(for office use only)**Economic Impact Worksheet**  
(Required for statewide amendment requests. Attach supporting documentation.)Code References: 2009 IRC Title: Retaining Walls  
Proponent: Anne O'Rourke Phone: 360 417-5615 Date: 2.28.10**Part I ♦ Amendment Benefit:**PROBLEM(S) ADDRESSED: Inconsistency created w/ rewrite of Section 404.1**PRIMARY REASON FOR AMENDMENT: (check one only)**

- ☐ Protect public health, safety and welfare  
☐ Reduce cost  
☐ "Manage risk" for government  
☐ Mandate from legislation or courts  
☐ Code change  
☒ Other inconsistency

**TYPE OF BENEFITS PROJECTED: (check all that apply)**

- ☐ Saves lives/reduces injuries  
☐ Protects/improves long-term health  
☐ Reduces construction cost:  
☒ Over existing code requirement  
☐ Canceling new code requirement  
☐ Off-setting new code requirement  
☐ Increases construction alternatives  
☐ Saves energy  
☐ Protects environment  
☐ Increases accessibility  
☐ Reduces regulation  
☐ Reduces government enforcement cost  
☒ Clarifies/improves existing code  
☐ Protects property loss/damage  
☐ Other

**Part II ♦ Amendment Impacts:**TYPES OF CONSTRUCTION: ☒ New Construction ☒ Remodeling/Tenant Improvement/Repair**COMPLETE TABLE FOR EACH BUILDING TYPE CHECKED**(See reverse for instruction on items <sup>a</sup> through <sup>e</sup>)

✓	Building Type	Construction <sup>a</sup> 1st Cost		Enforcement <sup>b</sup>		Owner <sup>c</sup> Ongoing		Other		Supporting data attached
	Residential	C/S <sup>d</sup>	Degree <sup>e</sup>	C/S <sup>d</sup>	Degree <sup>e</sup>	C/S <sup>d</sup>	Degree <sup>e</sup>	C/S <sup>d</sup>	Degree <sup>e</sup>	
✓	Single family	—	1	—	0	—	0			
	Multi-family									
	Commercial/Retail									
	Industrial									
	Government/Utilities									
	Other:									

**OTHER EFFECTS:**

Evaluate by number scale 0-3 (0=none, 3=significant)

- ☐ Likelihood for litigation  
☐ Decrease public cooperation  
☐ Disadvantage small business  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluate by letter code

(Spec, Custom, Factory, Remodel, Manufact., Other, NA)

- ~~NA~~ Advantage one industry  
~~NA~~ Disadvantage one industry

**Part III ♦ Comments and Recommendations:**

Evaluate each by number scale 0-3 (0=none, 3=significant)

- ☐ Difficulty to Enforce ☐ Cost of not adopting amendment  
☐ Costs exceed Benefits ☐ Degree of TAG controversy  
☐ C/S Confidence level

Evaluate Yes or No (circle one)

- Y / ☒ Were alternative solutions considered  
 Y / ☒ Recommend further benefit/impact analysis  
 Y / ☒ Recommend future benefit/impact review